

**Remarks/Arguments**

Claims 1-10 are pending.

**Rejection of claims 1-10 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Boyles et al. (US 5511208)**

Applicants submit that for the reasons set forth in Applicants' previous response of December 12, 2003, Boyles fails to disclose all of the limitations of claims 1-10, and as such, present claims 1-10 are not anticipated by Boyles.

Furthermore, applicants submit that present claims 1-10 are not anticipated by Boyles in view of Examiner's Response to Arguments set forth in the present Office Action.

Present Claim 1 recites:

1. Method for the distributed management of a catalogue of objects in a communication network comprising devices, the method comprising the steps of:

- registering local objects present in a device in a local registry managed at the level of this device;
- formulating, by a local object, **a request for a list of objects, the request being transmitted to the single local registry of the device** hosting the local object;
- propagating the request through the local registry to distant registries;
- **collecting the responses to the request by the distant registries and the response of the local registry; and**
- **transmitting the responses collected to the local object having formulated the initial request.**" (emphasis added)

The Office Action alleges that the 'request' recited in the claims corresponds to the 'LOCATE' request of Boyles. Applicants respectfully submit that the examiner has misread the teachings of Boyles and that Boyles does not disclose or suggest the 'request' recited in the claims.

In the 'Background of the invention', Boyles et al. describes a network in which a node emits a so-called 'LOCATE' request. The nature of the 'LOCATE' request is described, for example, in col. 2, lines 6 to 10: "... a network node

responsible for setting up a session between a source logical unit and a target logical unit obtains current information about the target by performing a search process or LOCATE operation at the beginning of each new session.” (emphasis added) This implies that the requesting network node knows in advance the identity of the target node, and that the LOCATE request is made **to obtain ‘current information’** regarding this unique, predetermined target, and not to obtain **a list of different targets**.

Boyles et al. then describes that these requests are made to cache server nodes, which look at directories with ever larger scope (local, domain, cross domain, other networks...) until the information requested for the one predetermined target is found – see e.g. col. 5 lines 46-53. Once the desired information is found, the process stops, and the request is not spread further.

By contrast, Claim 1 recites a request for a list of objects, and that a local object formulates the request. Clearly, a request for a **list of objects** is distinguishable from a request for **current information** about a predetermined target. Consequently, applicants submit that the request recited in the present claims does not correspond to the request for a piece of ‘current information’ described in Boyles et al., and that the parallel drawn in the Response to Arguments is inappropriate.

Concerning more precisely the limitation ‘request for a list of objects’, the Examiner cites col. 5, lines 55-56 and col. 8, lines 11-12 of Boyles. Applicants submit that these cited portions fail to support the alleged teachings of Boyles.

The first paragraph concerns a broadcast to end nodes in the domain of the cache server node where the initial request originated, further to a failure of locating the resource in its local directories (be it the local, domain or cross-domain directory).

The second paragraph concerns a LOCATE request made to ‘equivalent’ multiple cache server nodes. However, this is not the same as broadcasting a request to end nodes. Also, it is to be noted that the LOCATE request does not change in nature just because the request is made in parallel to several cache nodes. The disclosed LOCATE request is still only a **request for information regarding a single resource**, whose identity is determined by some non-described process.

In this regard, reference is made to col. 8, lines 32-40, which describes that while several replies may be received in response to the LOCATE request, these replies are verified in turn until one verification is positive. The non-verified replies are then discarded – while several replies are received they all concern the same, predetermined target resource. The verified reply – if any - is then used to respond to the request. Thus inherently, a reply may NOT contain a list of objects such as claimed. There is ONLY ONE response transmitted to the requesting node, and this response will, as mentioned before, only contain information regarding a resource, and not a list of objects.

Consequently, Boyles et al. does not disclose or suggest the step of “formulating, by a local object, a request for a list of objects, the request being transmitted to the single local registry of the device hosting the local object.”

Furthermore, applicants submit that Boyles et al also fails to disclose or suggest "... collecting the responses to the request by the distant registries and the response of the local registry; and - transmitting the responses collected to the local object having formulated the initial request" as recited in claim 1. Boyles et al. teaches that the origin cache server node first examines its directories, then if the target is not found, broadcasts the LOCATE request to the end node of its domain, then if no response is received, sends the LOCATE request to other cache server nodes etc... Consequently, the origin cache server node cannot receive responses from ‘distant registries’ and responses from the ‘local registry’, because no response from a ‘distant registry’ would be requested if a response from the ‘local registry’ had already been obtained. Such responses cannot be ‘collected’ and transmitted to the requesting object. According to Boyles et al., only one response can be sent to the requesting node.


In view of the above, applicants submit that Boyles fails to disclose or suggest, at least, the notable features of claim 1 mentioned above, and as such, present claim 1, and claims 2-8 which depend therefrom, are not anticipated by the teachings of Boyles.

Claim 9 recites the above-mentioned limitations of claim 1 in device form, and as such claim 9, and claim 10, which depends therefrom, are believed to be not anticipated by the teachings of Boyles for at least the same reasons as those discussed above.

Having fully addressed the Examiner's rejections it is believed that, in view of the preceding amendments and remarks, this application stands in condition for allowance. Accordingly then, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicant's attorney at (609) 734-6815, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

Respectfully submitted,

Bichot Guillaume et al.

By:   
Paul P. Kiel  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 40,677


THOMSON Licensing Inc.  
PO Box 5312  
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312

Date: July 6, 2005

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this amendment is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail, postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 on:

7-6-05  
Date

  
Lori Klewin